UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mN

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,428	10/02/2003	Gregory Richard Hintermeister	ROC920020161US1	8449

7590 05/09/2007

Grant A. Johnson
IBM Corporation, Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER	
DISTEFANO, GREGORY A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2109	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/677,428	**Applicant(s)** HINTERMEISTER ET AL.	
	Examiner Gregory A. DiStefano	**Art Unit** 2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *1/29/2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on 1/29/2007.

2. As per applicant's amendment, claims 1, 14, 16 and 20-22 have been amended, claims 23 and 24 have been added, and claims 1-24 are currently pending.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-13, 20, 21, 23 and 24 objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 6 and claim 20, line 14, the claims should read, "each configuration comprises ~~with~~ a plurality of settings".

Claims 2-13, 21, 23 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon an objected to claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The rejection of claims 16, 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is hereby withdrawn due to the amendment filed 1/29/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

6. Considering claim 20, "a signal bearing media bearing the program," claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are nonstatutory natural phenomena. Moreover, a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material does not fall within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in § 101.

7. In the amendment filed on 1/29/2007, applicant wishes to amend claim 20 with a further limitation of a "tangible signal" to overcome the claims rejection of being directed towards nonstatutory subject matter. The addition of the word "tangible" to the limitation of the claim is insufficient to overcome the previous rejection, which is therefore maintained. The examiner would like to suggest amending the limitation of "tangible signal bearing medium" to one of the statutory categories submitted within applicant's specification, such as a "non-writable storage media" or a "writable storage media".

The examiner would like to further note a discrepancy within applicant's remarks regarding the previous 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections. Applicant lists claims 21-24 as being previously rejected where only claim 20 had been. Furthermore, claim 21 is stated as being amended to recite the word "tangible", where applicant's amendment shows this phrase to be recited within claim 20. In the effort to further prosecution, the examiner reads applicant's remarks to previous 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections to concern solely claim 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-8, 11-13, 20, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minard (US 6,247,020) in view of Helland et al. (US 6,014,666), hereinafter Helland.

10. (Amended) As per claim 1, Minard teaches the following:

managing settings in a computer system (column 4, lines 38-40); receiving a setting selection from a plurality of settings (figure 8A -804; column 13, lines 38-40); determining an inheritance state for the selected setting (figure 8A - 805; column 13, lines 41-42); and displaying a graphical indication of the inheritance state of the selected setting (figure 8A - 809; column 13, lines 51-53).

However, Minard does not explicitly teach a method of detecting configurations of an executing application as recited in claim 1. Helland teaches the following:

detecting configurations associated with a plurality of instances of an executing application, wherein each configuration comprises a plurality of settings, (abstract), i.e. the developer defines the access privileges of the roles at package, component and interface levels of the server application. Furthermore, the examiner interprets multiple users accessing the same application on a server (Helland, Fig. 18) to incorporate, "a plurality of instances of an executing application".

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Minard's method of project management with the multiple user management of identical applications, as taught by Helland. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make such modifications because, (column 1, lines 28-31), i.e. in a server application that is used by a large number of people, it is often useful to discriminate between what different users and groups of users are able to do with the server application. One skilled in the art would have found such modification beneficial because an administrator could, (column 2, lines 49-52), i.e. declaratively and programmatically define access control to processing services of a server application independently of deployment during development of the server application using roles.

11. Regarding claim 2, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

discloses wherein the graphical indication of the inheritance state indicates at least one state chosen from a group consisting of: the selected setting (figure 8A - 809; column 13, lines 51-53) is inherited by another setting (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are being inherited).

12. Regarding claim 3, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

the graphical indication of the inheritance state indicates at least one state chosen from the group (figure 8A - 809; column 13, lines 51-53) consisting of: the selected setting can inherit or be inherited (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited).

13. Regarding claim 4, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

displaying a graphical indication of the inheritance relationship between the selected setting (figure 8A - 809; column 13, lines 51-53) and at least one related setting (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed).

14. Regarding claim 5, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

at least one related setting comprises a setting that is not currently in an inheritance relationship with the selected setting (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed and selected).

15. Regarding claim 6, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 4 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

the graphical indication of the inheritance relationship (figure 8A - 809; column 13, lines 51-53) comprises an inheritance indicator (column 12, lines 39-49 which describes that the user is shown an indicator which displays their selection and the its inheritance relationships).

16. Regarding claims 7 and 11, modified Minard teaches the method of claims 1 and 4 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

receiving a change inheritance relationship command (column 4, lines 28-32 which describes that the inheritance relationship can be applied via command-line or GUI) and changing the inheritance relationship for the selected setting (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed, selected, and changed).

17. Regarding claims 8 and 12, modified Minard teaches the method of claims 7 and 11 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

determining whether changing the inheritance relationship for the selected setting will affect other settings (column 12, lines 43-49 which describes that the user can see and determine which relationships are formed and how these settings are inherited).

18. Regarding claim 13, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 12 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

updating the other settings (column 12, lines 47-49 which describes that user can update or select among different settings).

19. (Amended) As per claim 20, modified Minard teaches the following:

managing settings in a computer system (column 4, lines 38-40); receiving a selection from among the plurality of settings (figure 8A -804; column 13, lines 38-40); determining an inheritance state for the selected setting (figure 8A - 805; column 13, lines 41-42); displaying a graphical indication of the inheritance state of the selected setting (figure 8A- 809; column 13, lines 51-53); a signal bearing media bearing the program (column 4, lines 55-56).

However, Minard does not explicitly teach a method of detecting configurations of an executing application as recited in claim 20. Helland teaches the following:

detecting configurations associated with a plurality of instances of an executing application, wherein each configuration comprises a plurality of settings, (abstract), i.e. the developer defines the access privileges of the roles at package, component and interface levels of the server application.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Minard's method of project management with the multiple user management of identical applications, as taught by Helland. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make such modifications because, (column 1, lines 28-31), i.e. in a server application that is used by a large number of people, it is often useful to discriminate between what different users and groups of users are able to do with the server application. One skilled in the art would have found such modification beneficial because an administrator could, (column 2, lines 49-52), i.e. declaratively and programmatically define access control to processing services of a server application independently of deployment during development of the server application using roles.

20. (New) Regarding claims 23 and 24, modified Minard teaches the method of claims 8 and 13 as described above. However Minard does not explicitly teach the method of detecting the configuration and updating the configuration. Helland teaches the following:

detecting the configurations comprises reading configuration files and further comprising updating the configuration files. Helland discusses in column 2, lines 5-31, certain network operating systems (e.g. Windows NT) were well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Helland further specifically discusses how a server application may receive a request from a remote user via a thread containing a user ID (column 2, lines 5-15). The application software then performs authorization checks on the request thread (e.g. read configuration). Helland later discusses that the access rights to these remote users are created and updated per each computer station and/or network (e.g. update configuration). The examiner would like to further note that the administrator configures these access rights and may later update them (column 2, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the project management of Minard with the security setting features of Helland. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make such modifications because, (column 1, lines 28-31), i.e. in a server application that is used by a large number of people, it is often useful to discriminate between what different users and groups of users are able to do with the server application. One skilled in the art would have found such modification beneficial because an administrator could, (column 2, lines 49-52), i.e. declaratively and programmatically define access control to processing services of a server application independently of deployment during development of the server application using roles.

21. Claims 9, 10, 14-19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minard in view of Helland as applied to claims 1-8, 11-13 and 20 above, and further in view of Cherdron et al. (US 2004/0064802), hereinafter Cherdron.

22. Regarding claims 9 and 18, modified Minard teaches the method of claims 1 as described above and 14 as described below.

However , Minard fails to explicitly teach displaying the current value for the selected setting. Cherdron teaches the following:

displaying the current value for the selected setting [0036].

Therefore, it should be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Minard by displaying the current value for the selected setting taught by Cherdron to maintain, store, and manage the settings that have been inherited and to be displayed as the current selected setting (see Cherdron, [0028]).

23. Regarding claims 10 and 19, modified Minard teaches the method of claims 9 as described above and 14 as described below. Minard further teaches the following:

using a control type used by a managed application for the selected setting (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed and selected).

However, Minard fails to explicitly teach the current value. Cherdron teaches the following:

displaying the current value [0036].

Therefore, it should be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Minard by displaying the current value taught by Cherdron in order to maintain, store, and manage the settings that have been inherited and to be displayed as the current selected setting (see Cherdron, [0028]).

24. (Amended) As per claim 14, Minard teaches the following:

the control widget (column 12, lines 39-40) associated with a selected setting (column 12, lines 43-47), the control widget (column 12, lines 39-40) comprising an inheritance state indication (column 12, lines 39-49); an inheritance relationship indicator that indicates the inheritance relationship between the selected setting and at least one other setting (column 12, lines 43-47).

However, Minard fails to explicitly teach the current value for the selected setting. Cherdron teaches the following:

the current value for the selected setting [0036].

Therefore, it should be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Minard by disclosing the current value for the selected setting as taught by Cherdron in order to maintain, store, and manage the settings that have been inherited and to be displayed as the current selected setting (see Cherdron, [0028]).

Furthermore, both Minard and Cherdron fail to teach the data representing instances of an application as recited in claim 14. Helland teaches the following:

detecting configurations associated with a plurality of instances of an executing application, wherein each configuration comprises a plurality of settings, (abstract), i.e. the developer defines the access privileges of the roles at package, component and interface levels of the server application

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Minard's method of project management with the multiple user management of identical applications, as taught by Helland. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make such further modifications because, (column 1, lines 28-31), i.e. in a server application that is used by a large number of people, it is often useful to discriminate between what different users and groups of users are able to do with the server application. One skilled in the art would have found such modification beneficial because an administrator could, (column 2, lines 49-52), i.e. declaratively and programmatically define access control to processing services of a server application independently of deployment during development of the server application using roles. One skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have been further motivated to make such modifications Cherdron discloses the issues of monitoring states of applications in a client-server system as he discusses in paragraphs [0005] and [0006].

25. Regarding claim 15, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 14 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

a property widget (column 12, lines 39-40) associated with at least one other setting (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can determine which settings are to be inherited).

26. Regarding claim 16, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 14 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

the inheritance relationship indicator (column 12, lines 39-49 which describes that the user is shown an indicator which displays their selection and the its inheritance relationships) comprises a graphical connector connecting the control widget to the property widget (column 12, lines 39-40).

27. Regarding claim 17, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 16 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

the relative positions of the control widget and the property widget (column 12, lines 39-40) indicate an inheritance relationship between the selected setting and at least one other setting (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed).

28. (Amended) Regarding claim 21, modified Minard teaches the method of claim 14 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

the signal bearing media (column 12, lines 39-40).

However, Minard fails to explicitly teach a chosen non-writeable storage media, a writeable storage media, and a communications medium. Cherdron teaches the following:

a chosen non-writeable storage media, a writeable storage media, and a communications medium, such as through a computer or a telephone network [0095].

Therefore, it should be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Minard by a chosen non-writeable storage media, a writeable storage media, and a communications medium, such as through a computer or a telephone network as taught by Cherdron in order to implement the computer program product in computer hardware, firmware, software or in a propagated signal, for execution and control of the program (see Cherdron, [0095]).

29. As per claim 22, Minard teaches the following:

a control widget (column 12, lines 39-40) associated with a selected setting for one instance of an application (column 12, lines 43-47), the control widget (column 12, lines 39-40) comprising an inheritance state indicator; an inheritance relationship indicator that indicates the inheritance relationship between the selected setting and at least one other setting (column 12, lines 43-47); selecting the control widget (column 12, lines 43-47) associated with a desired setting for at least one of the plurality of instances of the application (column 12, lines 43-47); modifying the inheritance state for the desired setting (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed, selected, and changed).

However, Minard fails to explicitly teach the current value indicator; modifying the current value for the desired setting. Cherdron teaches the following:

the current value indicator [0036]; modifying the current value for the desired setting [0028].

Therefore it should be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Minard by the current value indicator; and modifying the current value for the desired setting as taught by Cherdron in order to maintain, store, and manage the settings that have been inherited and to be displayed as the current selected setting (see Cherdron, [0028]).

Furthermore, modified Minard fails to teach a method of managing instances of an application as recited in claim 22. Helland teaches the following:

launching a manager (see Helland Fig. 4) for managing a plurality of executing instances of an application, (column 16, lines 3-8), i.e. the application window 202 hosts two panes 208-209 for displaying and navigating the structure of the server application. In a left pane 208, the Transaction Server Explorer displays a hierarchical tree graph of the server application structure. The right pane 209 displays contents on a particular server application construct (e.g., package, component, role, etc.) selected in the left pane 208. The examiner interprets Helland's system to encompass this limitation of claim 22 by a user of Helland's system may manage different types of instances of an application;

data representing a plurality of executing instances of the application, (column 16, lines 10-14), i.e. as shown in Fig. 4, a "components" folder 212 representing the components grouped into a package named "Sample Bank" is selected in the left pane 208, causing the right pane 209 to display icons 214 representing the components.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Minard's method of project management with the multiple user management of identical applications, as taught by Helland. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make such further modifications because, (column 1, lines 28-31), i.e. in a server application that is used by a large number of people, it is often useful to discriminate between what different users and groups of users are able to do with the server application. One skilled in the art would have found such modification beneficial because an administrator could, (column 2, lines 49-52), i.e. declaratively and programmatically define access control to processing services of a server application independently of deployment during development of the server application using roles. One skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have been further motivated to make such modifications Cherdron discloses the issues of monitoring states of applications in a client-server system as he discusses in paragraphs [0005] and [0006].

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/29/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they appear in the response filed January 18, 2007.

(A) On page 9 of the 1/29/2007 response, applicant argues that neither Minard nor Cherdron teach the limitations of "detecting configurations associated with a plurality of instances of an executing application, wherein each configuration comprises a plurality of settings" (claims 1 and 20) or "data representing a plurality of executing instances of the application" (claims 14 and 22).

30. With regard to Applicant's arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has applied new prior art to the amended features of amended claims (1, 14, 20 and 22) at the present time. As such, Applicant's remarks with regard to the application of Minard and Cherdron to the amended claim are moot in light of the inclusion of the teachings of Helland addressed in the above Office Action. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

(B) On pages 10 and 11 of the 1/29/2007 response, applicant argues that Minard and Cherdron are not analogous prior art and would therefore be improper to combine the two under 35 U.S.C. 103.

31. In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is readily apparent that under MPEP §2141.01(a), a reference is considered to be analogous art if the reference is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned. As applicant states, the instant application is directed to solve the problem of, "one particular problem faced by many of the administrators of these systems ("IT administrators") is that many of today's IT applications, such as web server programs, eCommerce application programs, virtual desktop programs, and server-based application programs, are designed to create multiple copies ("instances") of themselves, with each copy handling a specific task. These instances can all run on the same computer, or may be spread across multiple computers. Although this technique

has many advantages, one problem is that each instance of the program must be maintained and properly configured".

Minard discusses a similar problem in his background of invention in column 1, lines 20-55, where Minard discusses the trends of heterogeneous networks and the problems of applications needing to operate on different systems and a variety of platforms. Minard further teaches in column 9, line 64 – column 10 61, that a designer may view both a detailed editor and an end user view. In this way the designer may modify the "settings" as to how the application will perform over the network.

Cherdron discusses a similar problem in paragraphs [0005] and [0006], where he discusses how applications may have different states and network transaction in a client-server system

Both Minard and Cherdron are found to be analogous art to applicant's invention, as all three teachings are directed at maintaining and configuring application instances. The examiner would like to further note that the phrase "maintaining and configuring" is taught in both Minard and Cherdron by way of "designing and editing". Minard and Cherdron are further found pertinent because of the matters in which they deal, logically would have commended itself to the applicant's attention in considering applicant's problem (e.g. designing applications and maintaining applications).

32. On page 11 of the 1/29/2007 response, applicant argues that the addition of the new claims 23 and 24 recite limitations not taught in either Minard or Cherdron.

33. With regard to Applicant's arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has applied new prior art to the features of the new claims (23 and 24) at the present time. As such, Applicant's remarks with regard to the application of Minard and Cherdron to the amended claim are moot in light of the inclusion of the teachings of Helland addressed in the above Office Action. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23 and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The examiner would like to further note that as taught by Helland in column 13, line 45 – column 14 line 38, Helland describes a method where upon creation of a new instance of an application, a user may chose to either have the properties in the component context object 136 to be inherited from the creator or not to be inherited.

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Bale et al. (US 5,437,025), system and method for run time configuration of objects in an object oriented computing environment.

Jensen et al. (US 5,615,362), method and apparatus for managing relational data in an object cache.

Suppan et al. (US 2002/0196293), user interface display navigation and item selection.

Baschy (US 2004/0239700), user interface driven access control system and method.

35. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

36. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory A. DiStefano whose telephone number is (571) 270-1644. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm Mon.-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xiao Wu can be reached on (571) 272-7761. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

G.A.D.
4/30/2007

XIAO WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER